

Oct. 2, 2003
Atty Dkt: PRNW-113US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application for United States Patent:

**USING RELEVANCE TO PARSE
CLICKSTREAMS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Applicants:

Anthony Scott Oddo, of Hyde Park, MA
Devin Hosea, of Boston, MA

Assignee:

Predictive Media Corporation
Cambridge, Massachusetts

5 **USING RELEVANCE TO PARSE**
 CLICKSTREAMS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS

Cross-Reference to Related Application

10 The present application for patent claims the priority of and incorporates by
reference commonly-owned U.S. Provisional Application for Patent Serial No.
60/415,740 filed October 3, 2002 (Atty Dkt: PRNW-113).

Incorporation by Reference

15 Applicants hereby incorporate by reference the following commonly owned
patent applications: PCT/US02/16674 filed May 29, 2002 (Atty Dkt: PRNW-105PCT);
and 60/359,872 filed Feb. 25, 2002 (Atty Dkt: PRNW-105), both entitled User
Identification Methods and Systems.

20 **Field of the Invention**

 The present invention relates to methods, systems and devices for television
viewing personalization, including Electronic Programming Guides (EPGs).

Background of the Invention

 There has been a great deal of recent activity aimed at developing applications
25 that personalize an individual's television viewing experience. Many of these
applications require explicit input from the user. Such user input may take one or more
of a wide range of forms, depending on the purpose of the application. For example, if
the application is designed to help the user record their favorite shows, then the input
may require the user to navigate through a series of menus, or it may require the press
30 of a single button, such as a "thumbs up" or "RECORD" when the show is on.
Requiring the user to provide explicit input is often perceived by the user as being "too
much work" for the benefit of personalization. This has led to low adoption of these
types of personalization systems.

 Conversely, personalization systems that use no explicit user input, and which
35 instead rely solely on *implicit* data, face a number of difficulties that must be overcome
in order for the system to be effective. One such difficulty is determining when the

5 viewer is actually watching television. Another is interpreting remote control button events to determine which programs the viewer likes best.

The nature of the first issue is not as obvious as it might at first appear. The data generated by the viewer's viewing habits will originate from the set top box (STB), and most viewers rarely turn the STB off. In addition, the STB generally has no connection
10 to the TV set that would allow it to determine whether or not the TV is actually on. Accordingly, there currently exists no straightforward way of knowing, based solely on STB status, whether or not the viewer is actively watching TV. Even if viewers always turned off their STBs when they were finished watching television, one still would not be able to reliably conclude that the viewers were watching TV simply because the STB
15 was on. The viewer could be asleep, or they could be out of the room, and there would be no way to tell.

The second issue is closely related to the first in that they both rely on button events. However, whereas the first issue relies on button presses to determine if the viewer is actively watching TV, the second must impose some meaning on the button
20 presses to determine if the viewer is interested in the current program.

Summary of the Invention

The present invention addresses these issues by providing, in one aspect, a method of generating viewing recommendations in a television viewing personalization
25 system, the method including parsing, in accordance with a set of stored processing rules, a stream of command signals generated by a remote control unit in response to control sequences entered into the control unit by a viewer, to generate information representative of the viewer's viewing behavior; and determining, from the generated information, at least one viewing recommendation.

30 Another aspect of the invention provides a recommendation generating system for a television viewing personalization system, including a parsing component for parsing, in accordance with a set of stored processing rules, a stream of command signals generated by a control unit in response to control sequences entered into the control unit by a viewer, to generate information representative of the viewer's viewing

5 behavior; and a determining component, in communication with the parsing means, for determining, from the generated information, at least one viewing recommendation.

Brief Description of the Drawings

FIG. 1 is a schematic diagram of an exemplary content delivery system in which
10 the present invention can operate.

FIG. 2 is a flowchart relating to channel change events.

Brief Description of the Tables

TABLE 1 shows a log file of the type that might be generated by a
15 commercially available PVR.

TABLE 2 is another example of a log file.

TABLES 3-6 show examples of profile processing in accordance with the invention.

Detailed Description of the Invention

The following detailed description is organized into sections, as follows:

- I. Overview.
- II. Determining Viewing Events.
- 25 III. Determining Relevance of Viewing Events.
- IV. Algorithms.
- V. Conclusion.

I. Overview:

30 The present invention provides, in one aspect, a method of generating viewing recommendations in a television viewing personalization system, by parsing a stream of command signals generated by a user's remote control. An exemplary system in which the invention can operate is shown in FIG. 1.

Exemplary Content Delivery/Personalization System: Referring to FIG. 1, there
35 is depicted an example of a conventional content delivery/personalization system 100 in which the present invention can operate. The content delivery/personalization system 100 can include, for example (other configurations are also possible) a server system

5 118 and a network 116 for providing program content to a client platform/STB 102 and associated television 114 and PVR 103. The client platform 102 can include, or be linked in electronic communication with, a display device (such as a television) 114 for viewing program content, a user interaction device (remote control) 112 for selecting and controlling program content, and an interactive or electronic program guide (IPG or
10 EPG) system 104. Within the IPG/EPG system 104 there can be, as shown in FIG. 1, a profile engine 106 and a recommendation engine 108.

In a conventional IPG/EPG system 104 like that shown in FIG. 1, the recommendation engine 108 may generate ratings for each television show or other content available for viewing, using known methods. Examples of such methods are
15 described in the patent documents incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the recommendation engine 108 may use profile information made available by profile engine 106 to generate the ratings or recommendations. A conventional system can make use of these ratings to assist the viewer in finding and displaying programming to viewers, using known user methods and devices to generate an interactive display on
20 television 114, and can also use these ratings and profile information to deliver personalized content. Conventional methods of generating and displaying ratings and recommendations, and delivering personalized content, are well known in the art.

Those skilled in the art will appreciate that in addition to the configuration shown by way of example in FIG. 1, profiles and recommendations can, alternatively,
25 be generated at a central server (such as server 118) and transmitted to the STB via the network 116.

Referring again to FIG. 1, network 116 can comprise a television broadcast network (e.g., digital cable television, direct broadcast satellite, and/or terrestrial transmission networks), and the client platform device 102 can comprise, for example, a
30 known form of consumer television set-top box (STB). The network 116 can also comprise a computer network such as the Internet (particularly the World Wide Web), Intranets, or other networks. (It should be noted that the present invention is not limited to use with television systems, but can be adapted for use in conjunction with any manner of content, or information, distribution systems including the Internet, cable
35 television systems, satellite television distribution systems, terrestrial television

5 transmission systems, and the like.) As also shown in FIG. 1, the server system 118 can
comprise, for example, a video server, which sends data to and receives data from a
platform device 102 such as a digital STB. A user can operate the STB (such as to
change channels or adjust volume) by employing a user interaction device 112, which
may be, for example, a remote control device comprised of an infrared remote control
10 having a keypad.

Functional Overview: The present invention views the interactions between a
viewer and a television system (via the remote control unit) as a form of
communication. In essence, the viewer, through the use of his or her remote control, is
attempting to communicate his or her wishes regarding content. The buttons on the
15 remote control unit constitute a limited set of building blocks with which the user can
construct command sequences by which to communicate with the rest of the viewing or
content delivery system. The key to interpreting this communication is understanding
and identifying the context in which the communication takes place.

For example, if the user changes channels, this act itself could have a number of
20 meanings. In one instance, it could mean that the show the user was watching just
ended and now the user is seeking something new to watch. It could be that a
commercial advertisement is currently being displayed, and the user is changing to the
sports channel to check the score of a game. It could be that the user is no longer
interested in the current program and would like to find something else to watch. These
25 are a number of common examples; others are possible as well. Thus, the changing of
the channel by itself does not offer sufficient information to enable us to infer which
meaning we should apply. However, the present invention advantageously exploits the
realization that by combining the information of the button press with the context,
history, and understanding of the viewer, one can accurately and reliably determine the
30 meaning of the viewer's actions.

The ability to interpret the user's behavior not only leads to better
recommendations to the viewer, but it also allows the processing of their clickstream
data on the fly, thus reducing the amount of data that needs to be saved to make
recommendations. This is an important advantage, given the memory/storage space
35 constraints posed by most of the STBs currently deployed.

5 **II. Determining Viewing Events:**

The first part of the problem of determining the relevance of “clicks” or button presses is to know the viewing history of the user. A viewing history can be built up over time by keeping track of which programs the viewer has watched. This sounds simple in theory, but in practice, can be problematic. A central issue, as noted above, is
10 that viewing data is likely to be generated in the STB, and viewers tend to always leave their STBs on.

The information generated at the STB may be in one of many formats, but common to substantially all of them is the following information: timestamp, button event, and channel, if applicable. With this information, program data can be generated
15 by cross-referencing with a TV data source provider such as Tribune Media Services (TMS). Such a lookup may be performed at a server to which the data is uploaded/downloaded, or it may be executed directly at the STB, since the TMS data is typically made available there as part of the Electronic Programming Guide (EPG).

Parsing Principles: The inventive systems and methods described by way of
20 examples in this document utilize several parsing principles that facilitate interpretation of the data. The first is to assume that the user is asleep unless we have evidence to the contrary. Another is that if a button press event occurs, then the viewer is considered to be awake and actively viewing. If the viewer is awake and there are no button press events for a period of time longer than the “Session Timeout” parameter, then it is
25 assumed that the user is asleep. This assumption is made because we want to use the data to make viewing recommendations. By taking an essentially “conservative” approach, we ensure that the only viewing events we record will be events the viewer actually watched. Any alternative assumption would introduce noise into the system in the form of crediting the viewer with watching programs that they did not actually view.
30 This could potentially lead to spurious recommendations, based on programs that the viewers did not actually watch.

These basic principles enable the system described herein to determine what programs have been viewed by the user without mistakenly crediting the user for viewing shows they have not watched. These principles are relatively straightforward
35 for the case where the viewing data is being generated by a conventional STB.

5 However, if the data is originating from a device other than an STB, such as a personal video recorder (PVR), then there may be other issues to resolve prior to applying the noted principles.

PVRs can create problems because at times, the PVR will actively change the channel to record programs without any input from the user. Consider, for example, 10 TABLE 1, which shows a typical log file of the type that might be generated by a commercially available PVR from TiVo, Inc. of Alviso, California. As shown in TABLE 1, each entry has a timestamp, an event type, and an event description followed by further information depending on the event type. Note, for example, that the beginning of the file does not necessarily start with a “TVKEY_POWER” event 15 indicating that the user has turned the TV on. Thus, at the beginning of the file, it is unclear whether the TV is on or off. Further complicating matters is the fact that the TiVo device can be programmed to turn the TV on or off, but it does not always work correctly, sometimes causing the log files to have 2 or more successive power events when only one of them actually occurred. In addition, as noted above, user/viewers do 20 not always use the TiVo remote to turn off the TV. For all of these reasons, one practice of the present invention ignores power events and assumes that the user is asleep at the beginning of the log file, until the system encounters evidence to the contrary.

25 **TABLE 1:**

	1023360509 Key TVKEY_NUM2
	1023360510 Key TVKEY_NUM5
	1023360511 Key TVKEY_ENTER
30	1023360512 WatchTV live WFXT 25 SH0000010000 1023359400 1111
	1023360522 Key TVKEY_NUM0
	1023360523 Key TVKEY_NUM6
	1023360524 Key TVKEY_ENTER
	1023360525 WatchTV live WSBK 6 SH0005260000 1023359400 1124
35	1023360532 Key TVKEY_NUM1
	1023360532 Key TVKEY_NUM6
	1023360533 Key TVKEY_ENTER
	1023360534 WatchTV live LIFE 16 SH0000010000 1023359400 1134
	1023360544 Key TVKEY_SURFUP
40	1023360546 WatchTV live CNN 17 SH0204200000 1023357600 2945

5 1023360552|Key|TVKEY_SURFUP
 1023360553|WatchTV|live|NIK|18|EP2593950046|1023359400|1153
 1023360563|Key|TVKEY_NUM7
 1023360564|Key|TVKEY_NUM6
 1023360565|Key|TVKEY_ENTER
 10 1023360566|WatchTV|live|COMEDY|76|SH0000010000|1023359400|1166
 1023360573|Key|TVKEY_POWER

The example of TABLE 1 is a simple one, in which the user was merely watching “live” (or real-time) TV. The log files become more difficult to interpret when the TiVo begins recording programs without input from the user. In the example of TABLE 2 below, note how the first five “WatchTV” events each last 1800 seconds (30 minutes) and occur on the same channel. Also note that there are no button events during this time. This indicates that the viewer is not actively watching television. What has happened in this case is that the TiVo and the STB are on, but the TV is off and the last channel the TV was tuned to was |USA|29|. The TiVo begins to record a program on its own at time 1020682799 and changes the channel to |ETV|42|.

This poses the challenge of how to distinguish between the “WatchTV” events in the above example (TABLE 1) that were caused directly by the viewer and the ones in the example below (TABLE 2) that were caused by the PVR.

One approach might be to note that the “WatchTV” event caused by the TiVo was preceded by an “ST” event at 1020682798. However, it is preferably not to be tied to any particular TiVo nomenclature. Instead, it is desirable to use an approach that will operate on any data set and that will not need to be updated every time an STB or PVR company changes the format of their data.

TABLE 2:

1020666455|Ver|2.5.1-01-1-000
 1020668404|WatchTV|live|USA|29|SH0000010000|1020668400|4
 35 1020670204|WatchTV|live|USA|29|SH0000010000|1020670200|4
 1020672004|WatchTV|live|USA|29|SH0000010000|1020672000|4
 1020673803|WatchTV|live|USA|29|SH0000010000|1020673800|3
 1020675603|WatchTV|live|USA|29|SH1339430000|1020675600|2
 1020682798|ST|ETV|42|SH4971130000|1020682800|9|1|0
 40 1020682799|WatchTV|live|ETV|42|SH0000010000|1020681000|1799
 1020682805|WatchTV|live|ETV|42|SH4971130000|1020682800|3

5 1020684598|ST|ETV|42|SH4971130000|1020684600|9|1|0
1020684599|WatchTV|live|ETV|42|SH4971130000|1020682800|1798
1020684599|STend|ETV|42|SH4971130000|1020682800|9|1|0

Accordingly, one practice of the invention utilizes the following approach:

10 If the first “WatchTV” event is followed within a defined interval of time by a
“Key” event (all button presses are designated as “Key” events) then we consider the
viewer to be awake and we credit them with watching the program. For the defined
interval of time, one practice of the invention utilizes an interval of 10 minutes
(designated the SNOOZE_ALARM variable). Thus, from this example, we now have
15 two principles of parsing:

(1) Always assume the user is asleep unless presented with evidence to the
contrary.

(2) When the user is asleep, a “WatchTV” event followed by a “Key” event
within 10 minutes is considered to be a viewing event and the user state is changed from
20 asleep to awake.

What happens if a user has not been active for a time (no button presses) and a
new show comes on? Should we consider the viewer to be watching the new show or
not? This is again a question of how long is too long to be inactive. It will be
understood that there are periods of time when a user will essentially sit still and watch
25 a show without “clicking around.” With a PVR this is less likely, but out of habit, some
viewers may still get up during a commercial rather than hitting the pause button. Thus,
one practice of the invention uses 30 minutes as the SESSION_TIMEOUT. Other
intervals, of course, may also be used.

By way of example, therefore, assume that the user has been active, a new show
30 comes on, and the last button press was twenty minutes ago. For the moment, the
system considers the user to be active and viewing the new show. The system stores the
start time and program information of the new show, and then calculates the viewing
duration for the previous show. At this point, two things can occur:

(1) A “key” event occurs in the next 10 minutes, confirming that the user is
35 active (the 10 minutes plus the 20 minutes since the last key press confirm that user has

5 been active within the last 30 minutes – i.e., within the predetermined
SESSION_TIMEOUT); or

 (2) a “key” event does not occur within the next 10 minutes, meaning that more
than 30 minutes have elapsed without a button press, so that the user must be asleep.
The system thus changes the user status from awake to asleep, and the start time and
10 program info for any future “WatchTV” event will overwrite the current “WatchTV”
event during which the system determined the user to be asleep. When there is finally a
“Key” event, the user will be considered to be awake, and if the previous “WatchTV”
event was not too far in the past (10 minutes) then the viewer will be credited with
having watched that program.

15 This operation can be summarized within the second principle of parsing: the
user is considered to be asleep if there is a continuous period of time greater than the
SESSION_TIMEOUT during which there are no button presses. If there was a
WatchTV event during this time, the viewer is not credited with watching it unless there
is a key press within the time limit defined by the SNOOZE_ALARM variable (Parsing
20 Principle 2).

 If the user is asleep and a “Key” event occurs, the user is then likely to be now
awake, and the “WatchTV” event should occur within seconds of the “Key” event that
caused the channel to change or the TV to turn on. If a “WatchTV” does not have a
“Key” event that proceeds it by less than 10 seconds, then the event is considered to be
25 controlled by a TiVo (or other PVR) and not by the viewer, and it is not counted. This is
the third principle of parsing: a “WatchTV” event must closely follow a “Key” event if
it is caused by the “Key” event. Otherwise, the event is caused by something else and
should not be considered unless another Key event occurs shortly thereafter (principle
2).

30 Also in this practice of the invention, if, during any period of activity, there are
three or more WatchTV events in a row within the SESSION_TIMEOUT, the first two
are counted but the rest are not. The reasoning behind this rule is that if the first
WatchTV event was caused by a key press (i.e. the user is active), then the second one
could be caused by a new program starting on the same channel as the first event, but
35 the third is likely to be caused by the TiVo and not the user. That is, there cannot be

5 two consecutive program changes on the same channel without any interactivity on the
part of the viewer, or the session timeout rule would be invoked. Thus, three WatchTV
events in a row is an indication that the user is asleep and that the TiVo (or other PVR)
is controlling the events. This relates to a 4th parsing principle in accordance with the
invention: There may be two consecutive WatchTV events with the user being awake,
10 but the presence of three or more is an indication that the user is asleep and the TiVo is
controlling the events.

The foregoing rules or principles of parsing can be generalized to any STB or PVR-
like device that is capable of recording or monitoring viewing behavior. Substantially
all of these devices record timestamps and events and distinguish between button events
15 and viewing events. Thus, if we replace the TiVo-related terms “WatchTV” and “Key”
in the above list of principles, with the more general terms “Viewing Events” and
“Button Events” then we have a set of general principles applicable to all such devices,
as follows:

- 20 1. Assume the user is asleep until presented with evidence to the contrary
2. When the user is asleep, a program event followed by a button event within the
time defined by the SNOOZE_ALARM (10 minutes) is considered a viewing
event.
- 25 3. If there is a continuous period of time greater than the SESSION_TIMEOUT
during which there are no button events then the user is considered to be asleep. If
there was a program event during this time, the viewer is not credited with
watching it unless there is a key press within the SNOOZE_ALARM time limit
(see principle #2).
- 30 4. A program event must closely follow a button event (10 seconds or less) if it is
to be counted as a viewing event.
5. There may be two program events in a row with the user being awake, but three
or more are an indication that the user is asleep.

III. Determining Relevance of Viewing Events:

35 Given the foregoing methods and principles for identifying and categorizing
viewing events, the following discussion describes methods for determining from that
information the relevance of the events to the viewer – for example, determining
whether or not the viewer likes a particular show. This is accomplished by combining
the viewing events with button presses and user history in the manner described below.

5 For purposes of the following initial discussion, we limit ourselves to keys that are common to substantially all contemporary TV remote controls: numbers (0-9), channel up, channel down, power, arrow buttons (up, down, left, right), select, volume up, volume down, mute, information, menu/guide.

Each of these buttons has an obvious context associated with it at some high
10 level, but further inspection will indicate that at the level required for interpreting the user's interest there may not be an obvious or unique context associated with the button press alone. For example, at first blush the mute button would seem to imply that the user is not interested in the current program. However it could just as easily be the case that the user is interested in the current program but has been interrupted by something
15 else. By way of example, possible interpretations include the following:

Mute: volume too loud due to commercial.

20 Mute: volume too loud due to something in the program (musical guest, crowd noise, etc).

Mute: viewing is interrupted by something that requires the auditory attention but not the viewing attention of the viewer. Indicates the viewer is so interested in the program that they will not turn off the TV despite the interruption.

25 Mute: viewer is not interested in the current program.

One could continue this analysis process to create lists of possible interpretations for various types of button clicks. However, we can also usefully limit the list of all possible interpretations by focusing on whether or not the user likes the program. In particular, we are interested in three possible states that the user may be in
30 at a given time relative to the current program: (1) the user is interested in the current program; (2) the user is interested in current genre (i.e. shows of this type but not this particular show), and (3) the user is not interested in the current program. The following are thus possibilities of interest:

35 Channel Change: viewer not interested in current program; is looking for new program;
Channel Change: viewer surfing during commercial break; will return to current program;
Channel Change: program has ended, viewer is looking for new program.

5 There can also be differences in the relevance based on whether the channel
change was due to pressing the “channel up/down” button or whether the user entered
the channel number directly. This does not affect the relevance for the program that that
the user is switching from (in either case the user is no longer interested in the program)
but it may say something about the program to which the user is going. The following
10 are examples:

Info: user is interested in current program.

15 Menu arrows: user not interested in current highlighted selection.
Menu + Info or Menu + long pause: user is interested in current program genre.
Menu + Select: user is interested in current program.
Menu off followed by inactivity: there is currently nothing on of interest to the viewer.
Menu off followed by activity: no conclusion unless user went to a show they had just
seen on the menu.

20 Volume Down – same possibilities as Mute.
Volume Up – viewer is interested in current genre.
Volume Up – sound level was too low due to previous use of volume down or mute.

25 Power On – the viewer is looking for programming, start new viewing session.
Power Off –the viewer is not interested in current program and has ended current
viewing session.

How to determine which of these possible interpretations is the correct one? In
30 accordance with one practice of the invention, this is accomplished by combining this
information with knowledge of the user’s past history and current activity. Consider,
for example, a channel change event. If the viewer has watched the current program
previously and has a history of flipping between channels, then we can eliminate
various possibilities and conclude that the user is surfing during a commercial break and
35 will return to the program. Or at least, we will make no assumption that the user does
not like the program until we encounter clear evidence to the contrary.

This example suggests the utility of storing historical data in different ways. The
first is a simple viewing history of programs viewed and viewing durations. The second
is a surfing history, where surfing is defined as a sequence of several successive
40 viewing events of short duration (< 2 minutes). These histories can be saved in any

5 number of ways, from simply storing all the relevant data to using a compressed representation of the history via a grouping algorithm, neural network, Bayesian network, or the like. The choice of representation depends on the amount of space available on the STB as well as privacy issues that might arise from storing the entire viewing history of the users.

10 In one practice of the invention we ignore potential information from the volume and mute buttons, as these events often have nothing to do with the user's interest in the current program. The other button events listed above (menu, info, and power) are relatively straightforward to interpret, as described below.

IV. Algorithms:

15 This section describes an exemplary implementation, and variations thereof, for taking the viewer's clickstream, interpreting the relevance of the events, and converting them into numbers that reflect the probability of a user liking a particular program, genre, or station.

Surfing History:

20 It is relatively simple to reliably interpret the user's intent when they watch a program for long periods of time. In general, it is safe to conclude that the viewer likes the program. The challenge arises in deciding how to interpret viewing events of short durations. One might first assume that viewing a show for only 2 minutes means the viewer does not like the program. However, if the viewer does so repeatedly, it may
25 mean something else. This is particularly true for content such as news, weather, and sports. Empirical observation indicates that it is not uncommon, during commercials or "slow" portions of a sports event or other program, for viewers to "click over" to check the score of a game they are interested in, or to check the weather. In these cases, the short viewing event may be viewed as a positive.

30 For this reason, it is useful to keep track of the viewer's surfing history. This can be done in many ways, but a particularly useful implementation strives to do so in a manner that requires minimal storage of data, given the memory constraints of a typical STB. Therefore, by way of example, in one practice of the invention, the surfing history consists of the top ten surfing channels (i.e. any station viewed for less than 2

5 minutes). To generate this list, the system keeps track of any channel visited for less than 2 minutes up to the first 30 channels. The system then sums the duration viewed for each channel. Normally, the frequency of visits to a channel would be a useful metric, in addition to duration; however, since our example indicates that all of the durations involved are very short, the total duration correlates very highly with
10 frequency. Thus, only one such metric is required, and we opt to use total duration. In accordance with this practice of the invention, every few weeks (or at some other interval) the system clears out the channels whose total duration is below the threshold. This enables new channels to bubble up into the surfing history as the user's viewing habits change.

15 **Viewing History:**

In addition to surfing history, in one practice of the invention the system also stores a history of all other viewing events. There are many ways of taking the viewing events of the user and distilling them down to a compressed representation of viewing history. Some of these methods require saving the data for long periods of time. For
20 reasons of privacy and because storage space is limited on current STBs, it is advantageous to employ a method that analyzes the data, updates the user profile, and then discards the data. In the future, STBs are likely to have more memory, and PVRs may be more prevalent, such that data saving techniques will be more practicable.

Another point of variation is determining what information belongs in the
25 profile. Many approaches involve saving information about each program, so that the user profile would substantially consist of every program the user has watched, along with a description of the show and how much time and how often the user watched it. While the present invention accommodates such an approach, it can also be useful, in one practice of the invention, to use genre, station, and time of day information as a
30 proxy for program information. Regardless of which approach is utilized, the result is a profile consisting of "raw probability scores" that can be used as the basis for making recommendations by any grouping algorithm or data mining technique known in the art.

In accordance with one practice of the invention, the basic rule for updating a raw probability score is as follows --

5

Raw probability score = ((raw probability score * viewing weight) + score for current viewing) / (viewing weight + current viewing weight)

- - where viewing weight is same as duration, except in cases explained below.

10 Raw probability score is always between 0 and 1 and the sum of the scores in the user profile will add up to 1.

Channel Change:

If the viewing events following a channel change are all short (for example, less than about 2 minutes each) and they match the surfing history, then the viewer is
15 assumed to be surfing during a commercial break and will return to the current program. If the surfing does not match the surfing history, then the system assumes that the viewer is seeking new programming. In either case, the system does not render a final conclusion, in terms of changing the viewer's profile, until the viewer has settled on a new program or returned to the old program. The difference is significant, however, for
20 implementations of the invention that can proactively make recommendations to the user whenever it detects that the user is looking for new programming.

If the channel change occurs just after the program has ended (< 3 minutes) then it can be assumed that the user is seeking new programming. No conclusion will be made about whether the user is interested in the program that would have followed the
25 program they just watched had they stayed on the same channel. The reasoning for this is that it is unclear that the user would even be aware of what the new program would be. However, if the user stays on the same channel for more than 3 minutes after the "old" or previous program has ended, and then changes the channel, the system concludes that the user does not like the new program.

30 If using an approach that employs station information, the system can calculate station scores as it would program scores, as in the description below (and in FIG. 2):

If duration < 5 seconds, then:

- Do nothing
- Add to surf history
 - Station score = station score + current viewing duration

If duration < 2 minutes, then:

- Deduct from program score if not part of surf history
 - If current station is not one of the stations on the surf history then
 - Program score = ((program score * program viewing duration) – current viewing duration) / (program viewing duration – current viewing duration)
- Add to surf history

If duration < 10 minutes, then:

- Add to genre score
 - Genre score = ((genre score * genre viewing duration) + current viewing duration) / (genre viewing duration + current viewing duration)
- Add half to program score if program score is > threshold (30 minutes)
 - Program score = ((program score * program viewing duration) + (0.5 * current viewing duration) / (total viewing duration + (0.5 * current viewing duration)))

If duration > 10 minutes, then:

- Add to genre score
- Add to program score
 - Program score = ((program score * program viewing duration) + current viewing duration) / (program viewing duration + current viewing duration)

5 The numerical values shown in FIG. 2 are based on a 30-minute program length, except for the 2-minute length, which is the minimum amount of time needed to obtain a reasonable idea of what the program is, and to ensure that the user has actually seen part of the program and has not merely been watching 2 minutes of commercial advertisements. Ideally, if the duration of the program being viewed is known, the
10 system can utilize percentage of program viewed (33%, in this example) instead of minutes (10).

 It will be noted that a distinction is made here between the user having interest in the program and having interest in the genre or *type* of program. This is significant for at least two reasons: (1) it recognizes the fact that short viewing durations are not
15 always indicative of complete disinterest; and (2) it employs the concept of genres because genre information is one of the few pieces of programming information that is widely available and thus convenient for use in profiling the user's interests.

 As indicated above, due to space constraints in the STB, it may not be practical to store a profile containing all of the programs the user has watched. In that case, the
20 system can employ genre and station information as the basis of the profile. In particular, there may well be thousands of programs, but only a few hundred channels and genres. Furthermore, the average viewer only tends to watch 15 channels and about 20 genres, enabling compact profiles of approximately 35 floating point numbers per each user, as opposed to hundreds or thousands. In one practice of the invention, the
25 genre profile can be calculated as noted above and the station profile can be calculated using the same rules for the program profile.

Examples of Profiles:

30 The following TABLE 3 shows an example of a profile.

TABLE 3:

Program	Score	Viewing Duration in minutes
7 Nightly News	.6	90
Seinfeld	.2	30
Friends	.2	30

10 As shown in TABLE 3, the total viewing duration for the user is 150 minutes. Suppose, for example, there is a viewing event in which the user watches *Seinfeld* for 20 minutes. The system then adds the 20 minutes to the viewing duration for *Seinfeld* and recalculate the scores. The score of *Seinfeld* increases and the other scores decrease, as shown in TABLE 4:

15

TABLE 4:

Program	Score	Viewing Duration in minutes
7 Nightly News	.53	90
Seinfeld	.29	50
Friends	.18	30

20 In the following example (TABLE 5) the viewer watches 8 minutes of *Friends*. In accordance with one practice of the invention, viewing events of small duration (2 – 10 minutes) are weighted by a factor of .5, so 4 minutes are added to the viewing duration of *Friends* and the scores are recalculated, resulting in the values shown in TABLE 5:

25

TABLE 5:

Program	Score	Viewing Duration in minutes
7 Nightly News	.52	90
Seinfeld	.29	50
Friends	.19	34

10

In the final example (TABLE 6), the viewer watches 1 minute of *Seinfeld*. In this practice of the invention, events having a duration of less than two minutes are considered negative events, and the scores are lowered by subtracting the viewing duration from the total for the program, and recalculating the scores. This is only done if the program is not a part of the surf history. For purposes of this example, it is posited that *Seinfeld* is not a part of the surf history, despite its 50 minutes of viewing duration. The result is that the score for *Seinfeld* decreases and the other scores increase, as shown in TABLE 6:

20

TABLE 6:

Program	Score	Viewing Duration in minutes
7 Nightly News	.52	90
Seinfeld	.28	49
Friends	.20	34

The idea of weighting the viewing duration and recalculating the scores has several benefits. For example, the profiles remain normalized (i.e. the sum of all scores sums to 1). Programs that do not get watched decay to zero. Shows that are “clicked over” (watched very briefly) decay more quickly than shows that were not watched at

- 5 all. Shows that are partially watched increase moderately; and shows that are watched completely increase more quickly.

Menu/Info:

- 10 In addition to channel change events, a system in accordance with the invention can also update the profiles based on menu events, as follows:

Menu arrows: user not interested in current highlighted selection

- 15
$$\text{Program score} = ((\text{program score} * \text{program viewing duration}) - 1) / (\text{program viewing duration} - 1)$$

Menu + Info or Menu + long pause: user is interested in current program genre
Genre score = $((\text{genre score} * \text{genre viewing duration}) + 2) / (\text{genre viewing duration} + 2)$

- 20 Menu + Select or Info: user is interested in current program

- $$\text{Program score} = ((\text{program score} * \text{program viewing duration}) + 2) / (\text{program viewing duration} + 2)$$

- 25 Zero score

V. Conclusion:

- 30 Many variations of the methods and systems of the present invention can be utilized. Such variations may include (but are not limited to), methods of feeding into other algorithms, and utilizing station and genre information instead of program information.

- 35 It will be appreciated that still other variations are possible, and that the foregoing embodiments and practices of the invention are set forth by way of example only, and not by way of limitation of the invention, the scope of which is limited only by the following claims.